

APCS(Ex.Br)– Disciplinary action initiated against Sri A. Prakash, formerly Spl. DC (LA), PSVP, Unit-I, Markapuram - Article of charges framed – Explanation submitted Considered- Further action dropped – Orders – Issued.

REVENUE (VIG.III) DEPARTMENT

Dated:28-02-2014

1. From the Collector & Dist. Magistrate, Prakasam Lr. RC.A1/205/2010 dt. 17.2.2010
2. From the Chief Commissioner of Land Administration, A.P., Hyderabad Rc.No.VS III(1)/178/2010, Dt: 8-3-2010.
3. Govt. Memo No.11320/Vig.III (1)/2010-1, Dated:17-4-2010
4. From the CCLA, Ref. No. VS III(2)/178/2010 dt. 22.07.2011, 11.11.2011 addressed to the Collector &DM, Prakasam.
5. From the Collector & Dist. Magistrate, Prakasham, Lr.Rc.No.A1/205/2010, Dated:14.3.2013.
6. G.O.Rt.No.1296, Rev (Vig.III) Dept., Dated: 19 -08-2013.
7. From Sri A. Prakash, formerly Spl. DC (LA), PSVP, Unit-I, Markapuram
Written statement of defence dt.

@ @ @

Based on the reports of the District Collector, Prakasham and that of the Chief Commissioner of Land Administration, Hyderabad received in the references 1st and 2nd read above respectively, disciplinary action has been initiated against Sri A. Prakash, formerly Spl.DC (LA), PSVP, Unit-I, Markapuram and charges were framed on him vide GO 6th read above calling for his explanation on the allegation of committing certain irregularities in a LA case of PSVP, Prakasham District.

2. The charged officer Sri A. Prakash, formerly Spl.DC (LA), PSVP, Unit-I, Markapuram has submitted explanation vide reference 7th read above. He among other things, has stated that he has not completely relied on the proposals of Tahsildar, Peddaraveedu before passing the award. He has submitted that he took statements from the DKT holders in some cases as and when they available during his inspection. He further submitted that the Tahsildars are the custodians of the Revenue records and they certified as to the genuineness of the DKT pattas. But he has not simply acted on the DKT certificates of the Tahsildar. He has stated that he has also inspected personally and enquired the DKT holders and during his personal inspection and enquiry no body other than the DKT patta holders established their right, title and even interest over the said property / lands under acquisition has objected in sanction of ex-gratia to the DKT pattas. One person, who did not get exgratia with ulterior motive opted to put in unbounded allegations with malafide intentin. Basing on the spurious complaint of the said person, the enquiry officer has leveled allegations against him for appeasing the ego of the said individual, though the allegations are false. He has submitted that he has recommended to the Special Collector for sanction of exgratia to the DKT lands after passing these awards by the Special Collector, he has distributed cheques to the original assignees. Thus, he has stated that he has not acted deliberately without field inspection and committed any mistakes or irregularities in payment of exgratia to the DKT holders. Hence he has stated that the allegations leveled against him in Article of Charge No.I., is baseless and not true and the cheques were distributed after personal inspection and enquiry only and no complaint was received during inspection and also while distributing cheques. Therefore, he has requested to drop the the charge as he has never deviated the procedure as laid down in LA manual and acted within the frame work of Rules in conduct of award enquiry with support of the material evidence available in Revenue records and basing on the information made available by Tahsildar of the mandal. In reply to the article of charge No.II he has stated that during his verification of the land in Sy.No.187 where huge no. of teak trees existed in Sy.No.187. He got doubt about the actual No. of trees existing and their age. Therefore in his original inspection report submitted including patta lands vide SDC office Ref.No.B/122/07, dt.07.11.07 he has noted Botavia, Teak and bore for statistics without number of trees in Sy.No.187 subject to the final investigation by relevant departments. But

after proper verification along with concerned Departments he has found 3791 teak trees in the field of Indla Rangamma and 40 teak trees and 219 Sweet orange trees in the field of Indla Rama Subba Reddy and proposals submitted for tree compensation to the actual no. of trees found on the field during the joint inspection by the S.D.C. (L.A), Horticultural and Forest authorities and the quantum of compensation arrived at by them. Accordingly, estimation value has been obtained from both Departments for teak and Sweet orange trees and after approval in the DLNC meeting under the Chairmanship of the District Collector, on 10.11.2008 compensation for sweet orange trees were sanctioned by the Special Collector and accordingly cheques were distributed among the beneficiaries. Both department trees were handed over to Irrigation department on 04.03.2009. Since there are no instructions from the Government for Forest trees, to be placed before the DLNC for approval, they were not placed before DLNC.

3. He has further stated that he has not paid excess amount for the teak and sweet orange trees. Even though the trees are noted excess earlier by over sight the claim was limited to the trees counted correctly along with Forest and Horticulture officials amount of compensation paid to the existing trees only in Sy.No.187 existing on ground at the time of joint inspection by the S.D.C. (L.A), Horticulture and Forest Departmental officials. Thus he has stated that there is no excess payment as contended and alleged in the charge and as such there is no loss to Government. Therefore he has finally requested to exonerate him from the Article of Charges I & II in view that he has acted in his official duty as per the guidelines and LA Rules and never deviated from the norms while in proposing compensation either for lands or for trees and also there is no loss of any kind to the Government.

4. After careful examination of the matter Government have decided to drop further against him. Accordingly further action against Sri A. Prakash, the then Spl. DC (LA), PSVP Unit-1, Markapur, Prakasham district is hereby dropped.

5. The Chief Commissioner of Land Administration, A.P., Hyderabad is requested to take necessary further action in the matter.

(BY ORDER AND IN THE NAME OF THE GOVERNOR OF ANDHRA PRADESH)

**B.R. MEENA
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT**

To
A. Prakash, the then Spl. DC (LA), PSVP Unit-1, Markapur, Prakasham district
(Through the Chief Commissioner
Land administration,
A.P., Hyderabad)

Copy to:
The Chief Commissioner of Land administration,
A.P., Hyderabad
The District Collector, Prakasham district.
The Rev(Ser.I)Dept.
SC/SF.

// FORWARDED :: BY ORDER //

SECTION OFFICER